



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/796,769	03/09/2004	David Parro	005864.00384	3194
28827	7590	05/02/2006	EXAMINER	
GABLE & GOTWALS 100 WEST FIFTH STREET, 10TH FLOOR TULSA, OK 74103			DOERRLER, WILLIAM CHARLES	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3744	

DATE MAILED: 05/02/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/796,769	PARRO, DAVID	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	William C. Doerrler	3744	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) 1-6 is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 7,8,10 and 11 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 9 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 09 March 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3-9-2004.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 7,8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by

Colling et al.

Colling et al discloses a system for separating methane and carbon dioxide (paragraphs 4 and 5) by processing the feed through a distillation column 120 with the overhead being fed to a membrane 140. Heat exchanger 146 cools the returning reflux which enters the distillation column. 270 represents a heater/reboiler and 220 is a pump for the returning reflux.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 7 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over either Blachman et al or Valus (5,131,928 and 5,057,641, respectively) in view of Nakagawa et al.

Blachman et al or Valus et al each disclose applicant's basic inventive concept, a process for separating hydrocarbons and carbon dioxide (line 63 of column 3 of '928 or line 10 of column 4 of '641), with the overhead from a distillation column being fed to a membrane separator with the hydrocarbons being returned to the column (figure 3 of both patents), substantially as claimed with the exception of cooling the stream returning as reflux to the column. Nakagawa et al show this feature to be old in the separation using a column and membrane art (see heat exchanger 5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention from the teaching of Nakagawa et al to modify the separation system of either Blachman or Valus by adding a heat exchanger in the return line between the membrane and the distillation column to improve the separation in the distillation column.

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Colling et al.

Colling et al disclose applicant's basic inventive concept, a separation system which separates overhead from a distillation column with a membrane and feeds a portion back to the column as reflux and uses a reboiler/sePARATOR to improve the separation of the product removed from the bottom of the column, substantially as claimed with the exception of heating the stream prior to entering the reboiler/sePARATOR. Heating the fluid is clearly done in the separator 170 of Colling (otherwise there will be no

Art Unit: 3744

separation). It is considered obvious that the heating can be partly performed downstream of the separator to reduce the heating load at the separator. Such a change is seen as obvious to an ordinary practitioner in the art to reduce the load on the heater in the reboiler/separator.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 9 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 1-6 are allowed.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Valencia, Duckett et al, Burr, O'Brien, Goddin et al, Karode et al and McNeil show separation systems which use membranes in relation to a distillation column.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William C. Doerrler whose telephone number is (571) 272-4807. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 6:30-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Cheryl Tyler can be reached on (571) 272-4834. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3744

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



William C. Doerrler
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3744

WCD